

Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of October 9, 2013

Members Present: Capi Wampler, Brendan Ross, Nan Chase, Jo Stephenson, Patricia Cothran, J. Ray Elingburg, David Carpenter, Woodard Farmer, David Nutter, Tracey Rizzo,

Members Absent: Brian Cook

Staff: Stacy Merten, Peggy Gardner, Jannice Ashley

Public: Nicole Szlatenyi, Curtis Walk, Kevin Ward, Joseph Kitt, Diana Bellgowan, Jane Mathews, Steve Sreb, David Schweitzer, David Patterson, Mark Marshall, Scott Rivière

Call to Order: Chair Wampler calls the meeting to order at 4:00 pm with a quorum present.

Adoption of Minutes: Commissioner Nutter moves to adopt the September 11, 2013 minutes as written.
Second by: Commissioner Ross
Vote for: ALL

Consent Agenda:

1.
Owner/Applicant: Lyn Leatherman & Rita Corcoran
Subject Property: 29 Tacoma Street
Hearing Date: October 9, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9639.84-7307
Zoning District: RM-8
Other Permits: Building & Zoning

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project amendment description; Exhibit B – revisions to new construction worksheet; Exhibit C – revised streetscape; Exhibit D – revised basement, main level and upper level floor plans; Exhibit E – revised front (south), side (east), rear (north), and side (west) elevations including exterior feature details; Exhibit F – streetscape, floor plans and elevations reviewed March 2013 with revisions noted; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 25th day of September, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 26th day of September, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits G and H.

2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to Amend CA # 12-00004951, approved March 13, 2013, to read as follows: Construct a new 1½ story bungalow style new single family residence with front porch, rear screened porch and basement garage **per attached approved revised plans, dated September 16, 2013**. New structure will have smooth sided horizontal hardi-plank lapped siding on first level with straight edged shingles in gable above. Foundation will be smooth stucco over concrete block with stone piers under both front and rear porches. **Front gabled roof** will have a 7.75/12 pitch. Other roof details include exposed rafter ends and fascia boards. Roof material will be bronze standing seam tin with aluminum gutters and rain chains. Trim boards and porch columns will be miraTEC. Windows will be aluminum clad wood, double hung, SDL six over 1, with some 4 light casements on west elevation. Pedestrian and garage doors will be wood per attached specifications. Porch lighting per attached specifications. Driveway will be gravel with buffer plantings. Walkway will be stone. Trees to be removed per attached list. Retaining wall will be concrete block covered in stucco with stone cap. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for New Construction found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The proposed amendments do not substantially alter the design of the new structure.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Ross

Vote for: ALL

Commissioner Cothran asks that 116 Flint Street be removed from the Consent Agenda.

Public Hearings:

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Joseph Kitt
Subject Property 139 Montford Ave.
Hearing Date: October 9, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.12-2392
Zoning District: RM-8

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: B. C. Gudger House. Early 20th century 1 1/2 story gambrel roof Colonial Revival style dwelling. Shingles in gable end, weatherboarded, Palladian window, stylized Doric posts.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct a new single family cottage in secondary location on the rear alley behind main house at 139 Montford Ave. per attached plans and specifications. New structure will be two story, 1000 sq. ft. with horizontal German siding on lower level and wood shingles above. Hipped style roof with exposed rafter will have weathered wood asphalt shingle covering. Windows will be aluminum clad, double hung, one over one, in singles and multiple pairings. Alley entrance door will be wood. Porch entrance double doors will be full light/aluminum clad. Details include brackets, moldings and 4" window and door surrounds. Porch will have brick floor, T & G ceiling and fluted columns. Gravel driveway and parking area per plans. Native foundation plantings to be approved by staff. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Storyboard, materials samples, and window and door specifications are required for final review. 2. Verify brick for porch flooring 3. Verify glass doors are aluminum clad <p>The guidelines for New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the proposal.</p> <p>Suggested Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed new structure is appropriately located in relation to the main house. 2. The proposed structure is smaller in scale and constructed to be similar to the main house.
Applicant(s)	<p>Kevin Ward, architect with SouthEast Ecological Design, offers to answer questions. He passes around material samples, noting they are the same as the ones for the main structure. He shows a storyboard of the secondary</p>

	structure in relation to the main structure and a photograph sheet with a herringbone brick pattern and textured stucco.
--	--

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Chair Wampler asks for clarification on the porch flooring plan. Mr. Ward passes around a photograph sheet with a herringbone brick pattern he plans to use for the floor, and a stucco treatment that will be on the small amount of exposed foundation. Commissioners discuss landscape and parking plans.
--

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – new construction worksheet; Exhibit B – site plan; Exhibit C – 1st and 2nd story floor plans; Exhibit D – north, east, south and west elevations; Exhibit E – landscape plan; (*Exhibits F–H submitted 10/9/2013*): Exhibit F – photo sheet showing herringbone brick pattern and textured stucco; Exhibit G – storyboard; Exhibit H – shingle and trim sample; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 25th day of September, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 26th day of September, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits I and J.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to Construct a new single family cottage in secondary location on the rear alley behind main house at 139 Montford Ave. per attached plans and specifications. New structure will be two story, 1000 sq. ft. with horizontal German siding on lower level and wood shingles above. Hipped style roof with exposed rafter will have weathered wood asphalt shingle covering. Windows will be aluminum clad, double hung, one over one, in singles and multiple pairings. Alley entrance door will be wood. Porch entrance double doors will be full light/aluminum clad. Details include brackets, moldings and 4” window and door surrounds. Porch will have brick floor, T & G ceiling and fluted columns. Gravel driveway and parking area per plans. Native foundation plantings to be approved by staff. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

- a. The proposed new structure is appropriately located in relation to the main house.
 - b. The proposed structure is smaller in scale and constructed to be similar to the main house.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Stephenson

Second by: Commissioner Nutter

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Stephenson

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Mandy Kjellstrom
Subject Property: 116 Flint Street
Hearing Date: October 9, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.22-3251
Zoning District: RM-16

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: Early 20th century 2 1/2 story vernacular dwelling. Shingles over weatherboards, bracketed eaves, Montford brackets, large dormer, brick foundation, wide porch. (R.S. Smith, architect?) Before 1917 (S)</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Remove existing non-contributing shed addition and awning and construct a new two story addition on the rear elevation of the existing house per attached plans and specifications. Exterior siding materials and trim to match existing. Renovate front porch; work to include the following: 1) restore door opening, where window has been inserted; 2)remove door on south side and install a window to match existing windows; 3) replace all non-original windows with new wood windows; 4) replace wooden front steps with (). Replace roof with (insert color) asphalt shingles to match garage. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. It is not appropriate to replace wooden porch steps with concrete or brick.
-----------------------	---

	<p>2. Verify color of shingles or specify dark</p> <p>The guidelines for Porches Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 and Additions found on pages 88-89 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p>
Applicant(s)	<p>Curtis Walk, Legerton Architecture, shows a sample of the Burnt Sienna shingle color and passes around photographs of front steps in the neighborhood, with wood and concrete examples. He notes when wood is used, they are not enclosed and can breathe. He explains the current steps have been a maintenance problem for the owner, and the previous owner replaced them several times.</p>

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Rizzo asks if other stair material changes have been allowed. Ms. Merten says maintenance issues occasionally arise, but she does not recall specific ones concerning steps. She notes the guidelines on pages 72-73, and offers to do additional research if needed. She asks the owner to describe the maintenance problems.

Mandy Kjellstrom, property owner since 2006, says she has had to replace the steps once, and her painter Paul Dixon specifically put sand in the paint and took all measures he could to assure their longevity, but the lip of the bottom step has already fallen off. She says the previous owners had to replace the steps several times.

Commissioner Nutter asks if they are suggesting concrete. Mr. Walk says concrete would be suitable. Commissioner Farmer asks if the wood has been pressure treated (*yes*), and if other materials might be considered, such as Trex (*no, not a historic material*).

Mr. Walk asks to amend the application to use concrete for the front steps.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – site plan; Exhibit C – existing east, south, north and west elevations; Exhibit D – proposed main and upper level floor plans; Exhibit E – proposed east, south, north and west elevations; Exhibit F – streetscape; Exhibit G – nine photographs of existing house; (*Exhibits H—J submitted 10/4/2013*): Exhibit H – revised proposed main and upper level floor plans; Exhibit I – revised proposed west and north elevations; Exhibit J – photograph of proposed fireplace; Exhibit K – sixteen photographs of steps in the neighborhood; Exhibit L – shingle sample; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 25th day of September, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 26th day of September, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits M and N.

2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to Remove existing non-contributing shed addition and awning and construct a new two story addition on the rear elevation of the existing house per attached plans and specifications. Exterior siding materials and trim to match existing. Renovate front porch; work to include the following: 1) restore door opening, where window has been inserted; 2) remove door on south side and install a window to match existing windows; 3) replace all non-original windows with new wood windows; 4) replace wooden front steps with concrete. Replace roof with Burnt Sienna asphalt shingles to match garage. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for Porches Entrances and Balconies found on pages 72-73, Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85 and Additions found on pages 88-89 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The addition is inconspicuously located on the rear of the structure, and does not damage or obscure character defining features.
 - b. The addition is compatible with the existing building but inset to differentiate it from the existing structure.
 - c. The front porch openings will be restored to their original configuration.
 - d. Concrete steps are typical when enclosed by brick walls.
 - e. Applicant has demonstrated that the current wood steps have been impossible to maintain.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Carpenter

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Carpenter

Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Steven Sreb
Subject Property 109 Santee Street
Hearing Date: October 9, 2013
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9630.85-6109
Zoning District: RS-8

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report. She shows the landscape plan and says pier construction on the northeast corner has been chosen for tree protection. She explains the applicant has applied for flexible development for on-street parking, as the only parking available on the site is in front of the proposed structure on the footprint of the existing driveway.</p> <p>Property Description: Vacant parcel. Non-contributing rancher with termite damage was approved for demolition June, 2013, and subsequently removed.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct two new single family structures per attached plans and specifications. Primary structure will be 1 ½ story, 1,394 sq. ft. with front porch. Structure will have horizontal composite LP siding with a (”) reveal, and wood shingles in gables. Foundation will be concrete block with smooth stucco veneer and pier in northeast corner near tree to be saved. Windows will be wood, double hung, aluminum clad, one over one. Front door will be wood with transom and sidelights. Porch will have shingle sided piers, tapered wood posts and square wood lattice underpinning. Porch railings will have 2” x 2” pickets and will be (”) on center. Other details include 6” corner boards and window and door surrounds. Roof will be (insert color) asphalt shingle with gabled form, shed dormers and exposed rafter ends. Pea gravel walkway from street to secondary structure. Secondary structure, located behind primary structure will be 500 sq. feet. Foundation, siding, roof form, and porch detailing will match the primary structure. Front door will be wood, ¾ light. Landscaping per approved site plan. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Bring sample of siding, stucco finish, lighting and window and door specifications2. Specify width of siding reveal, width of porch picket spacing, roof color3. Verify T1-11 ceiling4. Railroad timbers are not an appropriate landscape material5. Tree protection should be wider in circumference <p>The guidelines for New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the proposal.</p>
-----------------------	---

	Suggested Reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed new structure is appropriately located in relation to the main house. 2. The proposed structure is smaller in scale and constructed to be similar to the main house.
Applicant(s)	<p>Steven Sreb, property owner, shows material samples for the siding and shows renderings of the two structures. He says he will not use the T111, or the railroad timbers.</p> <p>He shows photographs of the existing driveway and a site plan. He says he has considered several options for parking, and is open to the Commissioners' suggestions.</p>

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

<p>Commissioners discuss the proposed walkway and parking options, noting the walkway is located in the footprint of the existing driveway. Commissioner Chase notes the proposed plan maintains an appealing woodland setting. Commissioner Farmer favors on-street parking, to preserve the open green space. Commissioner Carpenter says the meandering walkway design is not typical. Ms. Merten says one going to the rear of the property might be, but not the one leading to the street. Commissioner Ross notes the disabled could not access the rear structure, Commissioner Cothran notes there are steps which already hinder access. It was decided that the path leading to the street was appropriate as it followed the existing driveway footprint.</p> <p>Mr. Sreb submits an arborist report, and says the arborist will meet with the contractor to insure the trees are protected. He says they plan to treat an oak for fungus that is on the neighboring property and remove encroaching ivy growth. He asks about alternatives for the railroad timbers, Ms. Merten suggests concrete or exposed aggregate borders, and says this could also be used for the back stairs.</p> <p>Mr. Sreb shows window and door specifications, and Commissioner Stephenson asks if there will be a grill pattern for the small windows on either side of the chimney on the main structure. She suggests a four light, and says two of these would also work for the dormer on the secondary structure. Commissioner Carpenter asks for siding details (<i>smooth</i>) and trim sizes.</p> <p>David Schweitzer shows roof color samples and door specifications. Commissioners discuss the sidelights, noting the area is small. Mr. Sreb says cost is a concern, so he would like to keep the design simple. He is glad to drop the sidelight plan.</p> <p>Commissioners Stephenson and Carpenter ask for clarification about the banding treatment and the siding reveal.</p>

Commission Action

<p>MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT</p> <p>Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – new construction worksheet; Exhibit C – rendering, floor plans and elevations for</p>

primary structure; Exhibit D – rendering, floor plans and elevations for secondary structure; Exhibit E – site plan with tree protection noted; Exhibit F – landscape plan; Exhibit G – two photographs showing street parking availability; Exhibit H – flexible development application; Exhibit I – rendering of proposed structures; Exhibit J – arborist report; Exhibit K – renderings of proposed structures showing paint colors; Exhibit L – window specifications; Exhibit M – roof shingle sample; Exhibit N – siding sample; Exhibit O – light fixture specifications; Exhibit P – door specifications; Exhibit Q – photograph of existing driveway; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 25th day of September, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 26th day of September, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits R and S.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to Construct two new single family structures per attached plans and specifications. Primary structure will be 1 ½ story, 1,394 sq. ft. with front porch. Structure will have horizontal composite LP siding with a 6” reveal, and wood shingles in gables. Foundation will be concrete block with smooth stucco veneer and pier in northeast corner near tree to be saved. Windows will be wood, double hung, aluminum clad, one over one. Front door will be wood, ¾ light. Porch will have shingle sided piers, tapered wood posts and square wood lattice underpinning. Porch railings will have 2” x 2” pickets and will be 3” on center. Other details include 6” corner boards and window and door surrounds. Roof will be Weatherwood Gray asphalt shingle with gabled form, shed dormers and exposed rafter ends. Pea gravel walkway from street to secondary structure. Secondary structure, located behind primary structure will be 500 sq. feet. Foundation, siding, roof form, and porch detailing will match the primary structure. Front door will be wood, ¾ light. Landscaping per approved site plan. Flexible development for all parking on street is allowed. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, and the Asheville UDO, Sec. 7-11-7 Flexible development standards, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The proposed new structure is appropriately located in relation to the main house.
 - b. The proposed structure is smaller in scale and constructed to be similar to the main house.
 - c. Proposed walkway is located in footprint of existing driveway.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Cothran

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**,

With the following conditions:

1. **Revised 2nd floor front elevation on the main structure be submitted for staff review showing trim boards, window and door changes.**
2. **Window specifications, revised front door specifications, and revised tree protection plan be submitted for staff review.**

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: ALL

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant: Brian Peinkofer/Jane Mathews
Subject Property: 18 The Circle
Hearing Date: October 9, 2013
Historic District: Albemarle Park
PIN: 9649.75-0294
Zoning District: RS-4

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: Chipmunk cottage constructed in 1922. Altered in the 1940's.</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct 2-story addition to the type 2 façade on south side of Chipmunk cottage per attached plans and specifications. Stone, stucco, wood timbers and brick quoin details to match existing. Windows on addition will be wood casement, SDL to match existing windows. Existing windows on south elevation will be reclaimed and used in addition. Install new wood, SDL casement windows on front/type 1 elevation with brick surround where porch was previously enclosed.</p> <p>Construct single lane gravel driveway with vehicular access from Quarry Road.</p> <p>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <p>The General Principles for Historic Preservation found on page 12, the guidelines for Additions found on page 33 and the Façade Identification Map found on pages 24-25 of the Albemarle Park Design guidelines were used to evaluate this request.</p>
-----------------------	---

	<p>Staff Recommendation: While staff is of the opinion that the addition is compatible with the original structure, staff asks that the applicant demonstrate that the addition is subordinate to the existing structure and that the addition is not an alteration to the type 1 façade for congruence with the guidelines. Applicant should also demonstrate that driveway access will not significantly alter the character of the site.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additions are not permitted on the type 1 façade. 2. Additions should be subordinate to the original structure and in no way overwhelm the original structure. 3. Additions should be done so as to not drastically alter the appearance of the building.
<p>Applicant(s)</p>	<p>Jane Mathews, architect, represents owner Brian Peinkofer. She gives an overview of the project and cites relevant passages in the guidelines.</p> <p>The structure was originally designed as a sleeping cottage for The Manor, it had two bedrooms and a bath on each floor. After E.W. Grove's estate was settled and it became privately held, the downstairs bath was converted into a tiny kitchen, and one bedroom was turned into a living room and another into a dining room. In the 1940s the front porch was enclosed and extended to the south approximately 8', creating a family room with a fireplace.</p> <p>Ms. Mathews' client wants to restore the original ground floor bathroom and create a kitchen in the current dining room, which was originally a bedroom; add a dining room as part of a new addition; and add a covered porch, replacing the enclosed and altered original porch. A master bedroom and bath would be created on the second floor of the addition.</p> <p>The site has extensive limitations due to its shape, slope and close proximity of the house to the property lines on the north and east. The site slopes steeply in front of the house to the west. There is a concrete terrace, probably an addition, on a flat area that extends to the south. The proposed addition would be over this area.</p> <p>Ms. Mathews cites guidelines and considerations that apply to her project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? No extensive grading is proposed, the topography of the site would be maintained (p.35). ? A covered front porch would be added. Chipmunk is one of the few structures in Albemarle Park without one and covered porches are strongly encouraged for new construction (p. 32). ? The west facing wall of the porch addition will be setback 9" from the original porch and solid porch railing similar to the original railing will be used, stucco with a brick edging (but higher to meet building codes). This will be setback 6" from the porch columns. ? The foundation of the new porch will be stone, matching the materials

	<p>and construction technique of the foundation of the original house and extension of the original porch (p. 28).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? The portion of the addition containing heated space is setback 11'4" from the original front porch and extends south 8'5" as seen from the west, front elevation. The addition containing heated space extends 16'2" beyond the rear, southeast corner of the existing house, the back. Setting back the addition at this corner is limited by the existing Dutch gable roof form, the primary character defining feature of the house. This form does not easily accommodate roof variations. ? To distinguish old from new, they will be leaving the existing vertical brick quoining to define the edge of the original cottage, and adding new casement windows in the rear wall of the new dining room, there are currently no windows on this facade on the 1st level. ? Two original bedrooms are accessed from a single stair with a landing centered on the existing rear dormer. To provide access to the addition without altering the two original bedrooms, the rear shed dormer will be extended to add head height clearance along a longer rear corridor. Windows will be added for light and aesthetic balance. A new shed dormer will be added to the west side of the addition to provide head height for a new master bath. ? Two large existing casement windows on the existing south wall will be removed, salvaged and relocated in the new south wall. ? The existing window in the family room is not original, and will be replaced with French doors to the porch. ? The existing brick circle window on the front wall facing west replaced a large original window. There will be a new window similar to the original installed in the original window opening, which will allow views and daylight into the house as intended. ? A small, freestanding garage to the rear on Quarry Road is not original, and presents parking problems. A short, one car gravel pull-in would solve this problem and a small retaining wall 30" or less in height to grade will be required for safety. It will not require a handrail. A small 2" dogwood will need to be removed. <p>Ms. Mathews reads guidelines that address additions, architectural style and neighborhood characteristics and explains how her design follows these guidelines: p. 18, "Additions . . . should not be designed in a style different from the primary structure on the property"; p. 26, concerning Roof Forms; p. 33, concerning additions 'blending in' with the original architecture; p. 35, concerning The Design of New Construction, "new construction . . . shall be done in the same style of the existing structure." She notes in all aspect of the design they have followed these guidelines incorporating details and style of stucco, quioning and half-timbering of the original cottage.</p>
--	--

	<p>Also on p. 35, concerning building size and scale, Ms. Mathews disagrees with “Except for Dogwood cottage, there are no long, narrow structures among the original cottages.” She notes Dogwood, Kalmia, Twin Oaks, Shamrock, Possum Trot and the Gatehouse, and to a lesser extent Pine Tree, Cardinal and Fruit Tree.</p> <p>Ms. Mathews concludes her formal presentation by reading from p. 9 of the guidelines concerning extenuating circumstances, which she thinks they have on the rear of the building, “HRC has the authority to . . . approve projects that meet the spirit but not the letter of the guidelines when it sees fit.” She says she and her client face extenuating circumstances with the site only allowing extension to the south and with the dominant character-defining Dutch roof form (breaking it is not structurally feasible in regards to head clearances and dormers). She thinks the rear was mislabeled as a Type 1 façade, given it is predominantly a blank wall. She notes the other façades are more prominent and contain many character-defining features.</p> <p>She offers to answer any questions.</p> <p>Commissioners Carpenter asks if there was originally a garage (<i>no</i>). Ms. Mathews says Albemarle Park was a shared landscape until the 1940s, and there had been a central garage on Charlotte Street and a stable behind Galax Cottage, no longer extant.</p> <p>Commissioners discuss the existing square footage and the dimensions of the addition. Ms. Mathews notes it will be adding less than 1/3 more, predominantly on the rear.</p> <p>Ms. Mathews asks if it appears there is not a consensus for approval after the Commission’s discussion, she would like suggestions on how the design should be changed to pass along to her client.</p>
--	--

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
Scott Rivière	<p>Mr. Rivière is a neighbor who lives at 150 Cherokee Road. He compliments Ms. Mathews’ architectural expertise, her previous projects in the area and her historical research on Albemarle Park.</p> <p>He presents concerns that the proposed addition will overwhelm the primary façade and not be subordinate in scale. He notes the cottage is visible from many angles, and its small size will make the addition seem large. He thinks the addition will fill in the whole lot, and notes Parsons was very careful about how the cottages were sited. He thinks this context will be erased, and is also concerned about the precedent that could be set.</p> <p>Mr. Rivière says technically what is called the rear of the house is actually quite visible. He thinks the addition will look double sized, even if only a third more, given the slope and character of the site. He agrees eliminating the non-original porthole window would be an improvement.</p>

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioners asks for Ms. Mathews' help in determining the dimensions of the addition. She says the heated area is approximately 14'x16'.

Ms. Mathews says she appreciates Mr. Rivière's comments. She notes ironically that she lives on The Circle, in a very small house built in 1906 that had an addition at one point which added 1/3 to the house, it is now 1300 SF. She says the house next door to hers had a 2-story addition to the west side in the 1940s or 50s, and another that went through HRC approval which was closer to half the size of the house. She estimates the house is now 3500-4000 SF. She says another house, Fox Hall, which is close to 4000 SF, with three floors of living space. Seven Oaks is a new house, the previous structure on the site that was supposed to be renovated was torn down in the middle of the night, and the new house is approx. 2600 SF.

Commissioner Rizzo asks about the ratio of the house size to the lot. Ms. Mathews says the lot is very small and limiting, the existing cottage is on the only flat spot, there is a steep slope and Quarry Road is very close to the house. She says lot size is not a good indicator in this instance, because the lots on The Circle are so varied, and they have a shared landscape. Commissioner Chase says the porch helps to minimize the mass of the addition, since it will be open.

Ms. Mathews says the structure was not originally a house, but has been used as one for quite awhile in an unconventional fashion. Its current configuration does not meet modern family needs.

Commissioner Carpenter is concerned about changing the nature of the structure, noting its size is reflected in the 'Chipmunk' name, and the small structures in the district contribute to its character. Ms. Mathews says most people assume her home is its original size, but it had an addition. She says this is why the guidelines insist the additions are seamless in style and character. She notes the proposed addition is only one room, on two levels. She says the site and roof form offer no other options for expansion, and notes the guidelines do allow additions. There are no Dutch gables with smaller Dutch gables in the district, and she needs the head height for functionality.

Commissioner Cothran calculates the original structure to be approximately 950 SF, and the addition would add 208 SF, not including the porch. She says the addition fits nicely and does not impact the lot much. Commissioner Farmer says he doesn't think this will grotesquely change the scale, it is adding a few feet onto a small house. Commissioner Chase expresses concern that there could be a wave of additions ahead for the district.

Commissioner Carpenter asks if HRC can vary setback requirements (*Ms. Merten answers yes*). Ms. Mathews says the owner will need a variance, since the existing house does not meet setback requirements.

Commissioner Ross says she shares Commissioner Carpenter's concerns. She says the lot feels full and is in a fishbowl. Ms. Mathews notes there is very little traffic on Quarry Road.

Commissioner Chase asks if the Manor has had additions (*yes, two wings*).

Commissioner Nutter says the entire matter focuses on the south façade, and the view will be no different, there will only be improvements. Ms. Merten notes it is designated Type 1 façade and additions are not allowed on that type. She says the deliberations should address this, and whether the addition would overwhelm the site. Commissioner Stephenson says she would like clarification on façade identification, whether the guidelines allow any flexibility. She says the

addition technically is on a Type 2 façade, but will impact a Type 1 façade.

Commissioner Carpenter says small houses fit into the pattern of the neighborhood as a whole, and the proposed driveway is a problem, the way it would angle into the switchback. Ms. Mathews says the driveway opposite is twice the size. She says the proposed driveway will be on a flat space, with no excavation required. A small retaining wall will be needed, and the pattern of the stonework on the house will be repeated.

Commissioner Rizzo cites general principal guidelines on p. 12 that additions should not be discouraged, and asks what other guidelines might apply. Atty. Ashley and Ms. Merten note p. 33 discusses façades. Commissioner Rizzo thinks extenuating circumstances apply in this instance.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B – twelve photographs of existing structure and site; Exhibit C – existing site plan ; Exhibit D – existing main level and upper level floor plans; Exhibit E – existing front/west, right/south and rear/east elevations; Exhibit F – proposed site plan and driveway layout; Exhibit G – proposed front/west elevation showing driveway proposal; Exhibit H – proposed main and upper level floor plans; Exhibit I – proposed front/west, right/south and rear/east elevations; Exhibit J – window details; Exhibit K – storyboard of The Circle; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 25th day of September, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 26th day of September, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits L and M.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to Construct 2-story addition to the type 2 façade on south side of Chipmunk cottage per attached plans and specifications. Stone, stucco, wood timbers and brick quoin details to match existing. Windows on addition will be wood casement, SDL to match existing windows. Existing windows on south elevation will be reclaimed and used in addition. Install new wood, SDL casement windows on front/type 1 elevation with brick surround where porch was previously enclosed. Construct single lane gravel driveway with vehicular access from Quarry Road. Construct a small retaining wall no higher than 30” along new driveway. Stone will match foundation on front of house. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the General Principles for Historic Preservation found on page 12, the guidelines for Additions found on page 33, the Façade Identification Map found on pages 24-25, and the guidelines concerning extenuating circumstances found on page 9 of the Albemarle Park Design guidelines were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. While a type 1 façade is affected, the main part of the addition will be to the type 2 facade and the overall appearance of the structure will not be significantly different.b. There are extenuating circumstances with the topography of the site and the roof form.c. Care has been taken to keep the addition subordinate to the original structure.d. The addition will not drastically alter the appearance of the building and preserves its main character defining feature, the Dutch roof form.e. The driveway as designed will not significantly alter the character of the site.	
<p>6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Albemarle Park Historic District.</p>	
<p>Motion by: Commissioner Nutter Second by: Commissioner Chase Vote for: Commissioners Nutter, Farmer, Elingburg, Chase, Rizzo and Cothran Vote against: Commissioners Stephenson, Ross, Wampler, and Carpenter</p>	
<p>Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.</p>	
<p>Motion by: Commissioner Nutter Second by: Commissioner Cothran Vote for: Commissioners Nutter, Farmer, Elingburg, Chase, Rizzo and Cothran Vote against: Commissioners Stephenson, Ross, Wampler, and Carpenter</p>	

Preliminary Review:

Owner/Applicant:	Elzy Lindsey & Lauren Carlisle/Mark Marshall
Subject Property:	226 Flint Street
Hearing Date:	October 9, 2013
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.13-15591
Zoning District:	RM-8

Staff Comments	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description: vacant parcel/check Sanborn</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Construct new 2,400, 2-story single family residence. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p>
-----------------------	---

	<p>1. Show precedence in Montford for entry shed roof configuration and uncovered front porch.</p> <p>The guidelines for New Construction – Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010 and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the HRC provide the applicant additional feedback on their proposal.</p>
Applicant(s)	<p>Mark Marshall, Trio Design, presents a storyboard that shows the proposed residence. He says the house plan is by Bill Alison, who produced a booklet of houses based on R.S. Smith’s designs. They have elements for modern families, such as a more open floor plan.</p> <p>Mr. Marshall says the house next door is owned by close friends of his clients, and he designed the front porch with this in mind. His clients asked to have as much light as possible come through the front room’s windows. He says he could extend the overhang to the front and over the porch to the side, to bring it more in compliance with the guidelines.</p>

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Farmer asks about the plans for parking in front. Ms. Merten notes the guidelines say parking should be in the rear, or on the sides of a house. Mr. Marshall says there is a steep slope in the rear that prevents this. He notes there is a wall between the two houses that would come into play.

Commissioner Stephenson asks if there are retaining walls planned in the back, and how much excavation will take place. Mr. Marshall says there will be terraces in the back and a patio to the rear accessed from the first floor.

Discussion follows about citing the house differently, to address the parking concerns. Mr. Marshall thinks it could be shifted to the left, so that a driveway could be along the right side.

Commissioner Nutter leaves, 7:17 pm.

Commissioners ask if there will be a walkway to the street (yes), and what the underpinning will be (stucco).

Chair Wampler and Ms. Merten remind Mr. Marshall to bring a streetscape and material samples to the final review.

Commissioner Chase leaves, 7:21 pm.

Other Business:

Commissioner Farmer mentions that some trim has been removed from 152 Montford Avenue, revealing more of the previous siding treatments. Ms. Merten says she will be in contact with Mr. McDonough.

Ms. Merten reports eleven bids were submitted for the Historic Preservation Master Plan. She says the Committee has chosen three applicants to interview. She says if the Commissioners are interested and want to attend the presentations scheduled on October 10 and 11, they may.

Commissioner Farmer asks about the status of the project in violation at 75 Magnolia Street. Ms. Merten reports a notice of violation was issued and the windows were removed. The trim will be taken off and she will be inspecting it after this is completed. Attorney Ashley says fines were assessed up until the point they agreed to remove the windows.

Atty. Ashley gives advice on procedures, asking the Commissioners to take special note of projects that are not recommended for approval, making sure they review the guidelines that apply. Decisions should be made based on what is presented at the meeting, but a preview of the reasons and arguments are often available ahead of time in the applications and staff reports. She says more guidance is needed during the discussions, and the Commissioners should not hesitate to ask questions of the applicants until they have the information they need to make a decision.

Commissioner Cothran notes items can be removed from the Consent Agenda by request, a motion isn't necessary.

Commissioner Cothran moves to adjourn the meeting.

Second by: Commissioner Rizzo

Vote for: ALL

The meeting is adjourned at 7:27 pm.